

**Technology Customer Council Meeting  
Minutes of January 6, 2004**

**F i n a l**

Present: Steve Mosena, Steve Morris, Greg Wright, Leon Schwartz, Rich Jacobs, Larry Murphy, Lee Tack, Gary Nichols, Carl Martin, Steve Gast (ex-officio), Jim Anderson (on behalf of Cindy Eisenhower)

Absent: Marv Van Haaften

Guests: Judy Peters, Denise Sturm, Lorrie Tritch, Erwin Erickson, Nadir Mehta, Glen Dickinson, Diane Van Zante

Steve Mosena, Chair, called the meeting to order. It was noted that a quorum of members was present.

1. Review and Approve Minutes – Leon Schwartz moved approval of the December 23, 2003 meeting minutes. Greg Wright seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, approving the minutes as written.
2. Information Technology Enterprise (ITE) Service Definitions – Lorrie Tritch. At the last council meeting, members requested definitions for Common Directory and Common Calendaring, as well a methodology for implementation. Prior to today's meeting, you received a spreadsheet detailing the number of individuals currently on the Iowa Hub, broken down by agency. This document is a work in progress; it should reflect first quarter FY04 numbers rather than a 5-quarter average, and there are discrepancies that still need to be resolved. The last three columns of the spreadsheet show ITE's perception of agencies' current status. In the course of directory synchronization testing, it was determined that agencies can possess and manage their own mail systems, and still participate in Active Directory.

Common Calendaring is a new service offering that will allow agencies to access employees' calendars to schedule meetings and determine the availability of others. Common Calendaring comes along with Common Directory for Exchange users and is built into the pricing structure for Common Directory. For agencies that already participate in the Exchange 2000 organization managed by ITE, the Common Calendar is in place and automatic. For agencies that do not currently participate in the Department of Administrative Services (DAS)-ITE Enterprise E-mail, the Common Calendar service is not available.

There are several assumptions associated with Common Directory, primarily: 1) the Iowa Hub will no longer exist, 2) as agencies move to Exchange 2000 or newer, they will be required to participate in the Enterprise E-Mail offering (model 1 or 2). ITE will hold individual meetings with agencies to discuss each agency's particular situation and consider potential changes. Steve Gast noted that in comparing current revenue from the Iowa Hub with proposed revenue (figured at 79 cents), overall

revenue would drop about \$40,000. ITE acknowledged that some agencies might end up being charged less, while others might be charged more. It was suggested that ITE add a couple of columns to the existing spreadsheet to indicate before and after costs. Lorrie mentioned an additional benefit; agencies' directory synchronization time investment would be limited dependent on the option chosen.

Effective July 1, 2004, DAS-ITE will no longer offer the current Iowa Hub service; it will be replaced by the new Common Directory utility. ITE responded to the following questions posed by council members:

*If an agency is moved to the Common Directory prior to July 1, will the utility rate kick in before July 1?*

No.

*Will agencies be responsible for updates to common directory?*

Payroll files may be the basis for imports to the common directory. Payroll files are updated bi-weekly. An agency will continue to manage the same file structure it submits today. If you are in box 1, ITE can do so on your behalf. It is the agency's choice whether to submit a file or to use information from the payroll system.

3. Finalize Rates for Common Directory/Cross Calendaring – At a previous meeting, Common Director/Cross Calendaring costing information was presented, with a proposed rate of 79 cents/person/month. That utility rate would actually be charged next year (July 1, 2004) and would replace Iowa Hub charges. It would be a fixed fee based on the same methodology used to determine HRIS/IFAS rates. Salary adjustment dollars were figured into the rate. The salary adjustment issue will likely not be decided until the end of the legislative session. If funding is not approved, the customer council may wish to revisit the rate calculation. The rate is prorated based upon permanent positions (excluding ITE) for the first quarter of FY04.

Jim Anderson moved that the council affirm its motion from the last meeting. Rich Jacobs seconded the motion.

Excerpt from December 23, 2003 minutes:

Leon Schwartz moved, seconded by Marv Van Haaften, tentative approval of the following motion, pending solicitation of feedback from partner agencies:

***A combined FY05 rate for common directory and cross calendaring based upon total ITE Utility Service Expenses of \$204,800.39, divided by the same permanent position factor that was used for HRIS and IFAS.***

Rich Jacobs commented that he had received input from Margaret Munson of the Iowa Utilities Board (IUB), as follows:

We have the following questions about the Common Directory and Cross Calendaring rates that are before the Information Technology Customer Council on January 6.

NOTE: Lorrie Tritch provided the following responses.

*Why is ITE exempt from charges for services?*

There was a good discussion regarding ITE being part of the position number or not. It was decided to exclude ITE, but not the other Enterprises within the DAS, from the position count, as an organization who provides the service typically does not charge that same service back to its organization. The outcome whether included or not, would not make much of a difference cost-wise because the number of ITE positions is less than 1% of the total positions used in the calculation. Thus the DAS Technology Customer Council voted to exclude the service provider (in this case ITE) from the position count.

*Will the charges for the Common Directory be in addition to charges for enterprise email?*

Yes, the charges for the Common Directory are in addition to the e-mail rate. The Common Directory service replaces the Iowa Hub and thus the Iowa Hub rate of \$1.31/month/account will be replaced July 1, 2004 with the proposed .79/month/position.

*Will the new Common Directory require more resources at the agency level than the current Iowa Hub?*

No, the new Common Directory should require no more resources than what is used today within the agencies. In some cases, it will be less.

*Does the Council anticipate that Cross Calendaring charges will be part of the enterprise email charges or that this function will be priced separately from other Exchange functions?*

Cross Calendaring is proposed to be embedded into the Common Directory rate. There will not be a separate rate for the Cross Calendar utility service.

An oral vote was taken on the aforementioned motion, resulting in unanimous approval. The motion carried.

4. Utility Rate Package Information – Denise Sturm. Patti Allen is currently compiling the rate package for DAS utilities, as determined by each of the customer councils. The rate package is targeted for release on January 15 and includes:

- ◇ Definitions of utility, marketplace, and leadership activities
- ◇ Listing of customer council members
- ◇ General description of distribution methodology
- ◇ Communication plan with regard to the distribution of funds
- ◇ Summary of rates that have been set, as well as associated expenses

- ◇ Recurrence of billing
- ◇ Items which will no longer be billed
- ◇ Description of each utility service
- ◇ Customer service phone numbers

Distribution of the rate package is expected to go to Agency Directors and Chief Financial Officers.

Prototype billing is anticipated in the near future and will be based on the system currently in use by the Iowa Communications Network (ICN). DAS will seek feedback to determine if the bills are understandable and meet agency needs. During the next six months, DAS will be looking at a new billing process. Denise also hopes to consolidate some of the DAS billings to agencies, as there are currently 42 different billings being processed by DAS finance staff.

Additional questions from the Council:

*Will the Auditor's office be involved in the distribution of funds for HRIS/IFAS?*

There is no definitive answer to this question, however it is likely the method will be reviewed after the fact, as part of the auditing process. It may be desirable to have the Auditor's Office involved upfront. Denise will mention this concern to the Auditor's Office.

*If the distribution of funds for HRIS/IFAS should run significantly short, when does the council revisit the issue to discuss alternatives?*

It will probably be near the end of legislative session before anything definite is known. Denise will be meeting in small groups or individually with Chief Financial Officers to explain the process.

### 3. Other Discussion

Lorrie commended the Council for its work over the past several months.

The next council meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, January 13. Due to the fact that the council has finalized rates for IFAS, HRIS, and Common Directory/Cross Calendaring, that meeting is no longer needed. A new meeting date was tentatively set for the second Tuesday in March.

Items for the March meeting:

- a) Corrections to the spreadsheet will be made and redistributed
- b) If the distribution of funds for HRIS/IFAS runs significantly short, when does the council discuss alternatives?
- c) More information/presentation on proposed distribution methodology
- d) Council response to the proposed distribution methodology
- e) Elect/approve public member
- f) Set meeting dates for remainder of 2004

There being no further business, Steve Mosená moved, seconded by Jim Anderson, that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 2:17 p.m.